

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars:

1. Amendments and Support for Same

By the Response, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 have been amended to correct all informalities noted by the Examiner. Support for the amended claim 6 may be found in, e.g., page 6, lines 3 – 6 of the original specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-2 and 4-11 are respectfully submitted for consideration. Approval and entry of the amendments are respectfully requested.

2. Claim objection

With respect to the objection to claim 10 as being grammatically incorrect, Applicant has amended the claim, as shown above without adding new matter. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

3. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, as shown above, to address and correct all informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, 2nd paragraph, rejections of claims 1-2 and 4-11.

4. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US 7,062,391) in view of Avrin (US 2002-0151779), Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection at least for the reasons set forth below.

Initially, the Examiner is thanked for confirming with Applicant's representative on about September 15, 2011 via telephone that Wilson does have a later priority date than Applicant's priority date of January 19, 2004 in the FI-20040070 application, and for pointing out that Applicant may submit a certified English translation for the FI-20040070 application to perfect the claimed priority date and to overcome the rejection over Wilson. Accordingly, Applicant submits herewith a verified English translation for the FI-20040070 application. As such, Wilson is no longer available as prior art, and the obviousness rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-11 has been rendered moot.

Notwithstanding the fact that the obviousness rejection has been rendered moot, Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks regarding Avrin.

Avrin generally describes a method and system for minimizing effects of temperature drift in a magnetic susceptibility measurement instrument. The invention discloses a coil system where a field generating element and a magnetic sensor are arranged such that the signal due to the applied field is cancelled out.

Regarding amended independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Avrin fails to teach, disclose or suggest the features of separating from a signal registered using a measuring instrument that measures a dynamic phenomenon, a signal associated with a static source in a measurement object, in which method the measurement object and the measuring instrument move with respect to one another, wherein the measurement object is freely movable; determining the movement of the measuring instrument and the measurement object with respect to one another based on the signal registered using the measuring instrument; modelling the movement of the measurement object as a movement of the measuring instrument around the measurement object; presenting the signal registered as elementary fields in a signal space basis whose basis vector coefficients have been attached to the co-ordinates of the measurement object based on a known geometry between the measurement object and the measuring

instrument, whereby the signal produced by a static source is detected as a static signal as claimed in amended independent claim 1.

In relying on Avrin, the Examiner alleges that Avrin discloses separating the aforementioned static signal from the signal registered. However, Avrin fails to disclose separating the aforementioned static signal from the measurement signal measured in the context of a computation involving the modelling the movement of the measurement object as a movement of the measuring instrument around the measurement object.

In Avrin, the separation is merely based on a cancellation of the field by positioning of the coils applying the field to the measurement sensors, and Avrin does not teach, disclose or suggest anything regarding modelling. Hence, a person skilled in the art would not combine the teachings of Avrin in the context of the aforementioned features of separating from a signal registered using a measuring instrument that measures a dynamic phenomenon, a signal associated with a static source in a measurement object, in which method the measurement object and the measuring instrument move with respect to one another, wherein the measurement object is freely movable; determining the movement of the measuring instrument and the measurement object with respect to one another based on the signal registered using the measuring instrument; modelling the movement of the measurement object as a movement of the measuring instrument around the measurement object; presenting the signal registered as elementary fields in a signal space basis whose basis vector coefficients have been attached to the co-ordinates of the measurement object based on a known geometry between the measurement object and the measuring instrument, whereby the signal produced by a static source is detected as a static signal.

In view of the amendment and arguments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 4-11.

5. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and in further view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is requested that claims 1-2 and 4-11 be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's representative, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown.

Further, while no fees are believed to be due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4525.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald R. Studebaker/
Donald R. Studebaker
Registration No. 32,815

Studebaker & Brackett PC
One Fountain Square
11911 Freedom Drive
Suite 750
Reston, Virginia 20190
(703) 390-9051
Fax: (703) 390-1277
don.studebaker@sbpatentlaw.com